

Reply-To: bu.edu!INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL
Subject: INFO-HAMS Digest V89 #958
To: INFO-HAMS@WSMR-SIMTEL20.ARMY.MIL

INFO-HAMS Digest Fri, 1 Dec 89 Volume 89 : Issue 958

Today's Topics:

 IC-2400 dual-bander
 military call signs.....etc.
 Nintendo on airplanes!?!?!?!
 Radio (RF) Modems
 Scanning food service (2 msgs)
 Wall Street Journal on cordless phone listening

Date: 1 Dec 89 15:17:00 GMT
From: silver!commgrp@iuvox.cs.indiana.edu
Subject: IC-2400 dual-bander
Message-ID: <12600085@silver>

>Does anyone have any opinions about the new ICOM IC-2400 dual-band
>transceiver? I'm looking for comments pro or con about the
>performance of the rig. I'd also like to know if anyone has
>information on extending the rig's receive range up to 460 or 470 MHz.
>Thanks and 73,
>Harold KB2M hwd@pyuxz.bellcore.com

I haven't actually seen an IC-2400 but the Nov/Dec 1989 _Icom
Newsletter_ from International Radio and Computers, Inc. [751 S.
Macedo Blvd., Port St. Lucie, FL 34983 (407)878-8856] describes
mods for IC-2400 which expand UHF coverage 400-479 MHz and VHF 138-174
MHz. There is also a 300 MHz mod, and a crossband repeater mod. Does
anyone know if the IC-2400 in repeater mode will do offsets??

Same issue of Icom Newsletter has out-of-band mod for IC-2GAT (add a
diode, no retuning). A friend did this and his rig now transmits
138-178 MHz.

--

Frank W9MKV reid@gold.bacs.indiana.edu

Date: 1 Dec 89 15:26:17 GMT
From: jupiter!karn@bellcore.com (Phil R. Karn)
Subject: military call signs.....etc.
Message-ID: <18435@bellcore.bellcore.com>

In article <1295@mipos3.intel.com> jmasters@fmdgr1.intel.com (Justin Masters ~) writes:

>> In my original posting I was only looking for similar info. NOTHING
>>CLASSIFIED.

>

>That may be true, but your piecing it together and putting it on the net in
>one piece may be a violation.

The notion that an ordinary citizen could assemble unclassified, publicly available information into a "classified whole" subject to government censorship was resoundly squashed by the Federal courts about 10 years ago in the Progressive case.

For those of you who don't remember this case, the Progressive was a magazine that ran articles on the details of how thermonuclear bombs work. They worked from unclassified sources, with considerable technical assistance from a guy who knew nuclear physics, but never had access to classified information. The government attempted to prevent publication on the grounds that, even though the sources were all public and unclassified, the collection of that public information into a single place somehow still represented a threat to national security.

The court threw out this absurd notion, the government dropped the case, and ten years later the Republic still stands.

This case, and many others like it, have convinced me that the courts are about the only institution that keeps the US from turning into a police state.

Phil

Date: Fri, 1 Dec 89 09:40:17 -0800
From: Doug Faunt N6TQS 415-688-8269 <faunt@cisco.com>
Subject: Nintendo on airplanes!?!?!?!?

Did they attempt to contact the owner of the luggage?
If not, that was stupid.
If they did make the attempt, and the owner was not available, not on the flight, blowing it up was exactly the right thing.

Date: 1 Dec 89 18:44:57 GMT
From: att!cbnewsm!mhgki!rma@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (atkins, robert m)
Subject: Radio (RF) Modems

Message-ID: <7245@cbnewsm.ATT.COM>

In article <8912010803.AA03217@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>, 702WFG@SCRVMSYS.BITNET (bill gunshannon) writes:

> Bob,

> I have been in touch with the company and received their whole package.
> The reason they don't mention HAM Radio is because that isn't their target
> market. They are aimed strictly at the business market. After all, if
> you read the flyer, you will see that their answer to a TNC (not the PC
> card) has an RS232 Synchronous Port. How many 3270 terminals do you have
> sitting around your house??? :-) Interestingly enough, I worked on
> designing a similar system with a friend who was also in the commercial
> radio biz about 3 years ago and we were able to build a system the could
> have sold for \$1000 and did all the same things. Looks like a pretty
> good markup on their product line.
>

Bill,

Their stand alone modem may be synchronous, but their PC card does not require any unusual hardware (just a PC from XT types on up). I'm sure hams are not their market (at \$2400 a board). It sound like a really neat device if you can afford one. My only concern is the possibility of commercial users straying into the ham bands. Its unlikely but has happened in the past. Whenever a company markets a product whose main customer is likely to be the non-ham market, and the product can operate on ham frequencies then there is a situation to be watched. Note that there is nothing wrong with selling such a product and it would be great if an inexpensive ham version were available, but in these days of relaxed ID requirements, it is difficult to tell a ham generated burst of digital data from a similar commercial burst, particularly if it uses an unorthodox modulation scheme at high bit rates. My concern is only to keep a watch out for unauthorized use of ham frequencies by commercial users. The manufacturer of the device is not, of course, responsible for such use, but their statement "Use of radio frequencies (in the range 406-470 MHz) may require prior authorization" is a bit weak.

Bob Atkins KA1GT

Date: 1 Dec 89 15:42:00 GMT

From: shlump.nac.dec.com!leaf.enet.dec.com@decuac.dec.com (Steve Dowman)

Subject: Scanning food service

Message-ID: <6520@shlump.nac.dec.com>

In article <8912010815.AA04489@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU>, MROWEN@STLAWU.BITNET ("Mike Owen, W9IP") writes...

{Regarding the earlier, exhaustive posting regarding

{food service frequencies:

{

> cordless phones don't have a reasonable expectation of privacy and
> therefore aren't covered by the Fourth Amendment. ... Both the
[rest of the article deleted]

So what is different about cellular - why is it "protected"? It's on
different frequencies, but no harder to receive. In some senses, it's
EASIER (higher power, older TV tuners tune it...).

I ask this rhetorically; I know why HBO and cellular people want protection,
I just don't think they have any more "reasonable expectation of privacy"
when transmitting in the clear (or using readily decrypted methods).

--

Mike Pflueger @ AG Communication Systems (formerly GTE Comm. Sys.), Phoenix, AZ
UUCP: {...!ames!ncar!noao!asuvax | uunet!zardoz!hrc | att!g!tephx!pfluegerm
Work: 602-582-7049 FAX: 602-581-4850 Home: 602-439-1978
Packet: WD8KPZ @ W1FJI

End of INFO-HAMS Digest V89 Issue #958
